



United States Environmental Protection Agency  
Washington, D.C. 20460

## Water Compliance Inspection Report

### Section A: National Data System Coding (i.e., PCS)

Transaction Code	NPDES	yr/mo/day	Inspection Type	Inspector	Fac Type
1 <u>M</u>	<u>WA40006116</u>	<u>1</u> <u>3</u> <u>0</u> <u>2</u> <u>1</u> <u>2</u>	<u>=</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>3</u>
Remarks					
21					
66					
Inspection Work Days	Facility Self-Monitoring Evaluation Rating	BI	QA	Reserved	
67 <u>1</u> <u>69</u>	70 <u>1</u>	71 <u>1</u>	72 <u>1</u>	73 <u>1</u> <u>74</u>	75 <u>1</u> <u>80</u>

### Section B: Facility Data

Name and Location of Facility Inspected (For industrial users discharging to POTW, also include POTW name and NPDES permit number)	Entry Time/Date	Permit Effective Date
R Bajema Farm Inc 792 E Badger Rd Lynden, WA 98264	9:48 am <u>02/12/2013</u>	
	Exit Time/Date	Permit Expiration Date
	10:00 am <u>02/12/2013</u>	
Name(s) of On-Site Representative(s)/Title(s)/Phone and Fax Number(s)	Other Facility Data (e.g., SIC NAICS, and other descriptive information)	
Roger Bajema, Owner, 360-815-1383	Unpermitted *Denied Access*	
Name, Address of Responsible Official/Title/Phone and Fax Number	NAICS: 11212 <u>8</u>	
Roger Bajema 792 E Badger Rd Lynden, WA 98264	Contacted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

### Section C: Areas Evaluated During Inspection (Check only those areas evaluated)

<input type="checkbox"/> Permit	<input type="checkbox"/> Self-Monitoring Program	<input type="checkbox"/> Pretreatment	<input type="checkbox"/> MS4
<input type="checkbox"/> Records/Reports	<input type="checkbox"/> Compliance Schedules	<input type="checkbox"/> Pollution Prevention	
<input type="checkbox"/> Facility Site Review	<input type="checkbox"/> Laboratory	<input type="checkbox"/> Storm Water	
<input type="checkbox"/> Effluent/Receiving Waters	<input type="checkbox"/> Operations & Maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/> Combined Sewer Overflow	
<input type="checkbox"/> Flow Measurement	<input type="checkbox"/> Sludge Handling/Disposal	<input type="checkbox"/> Sanitary Sewer Overflow	

### Section D: Summary of Findings/Comments

(Attach additional sheets of narrative and checklists, including Single Event Violation codes, as necessary)

SEV Codes	SEV Description
• • • • •	
• • • • •	
• • • • •	
• • • • •	

**RECEIVED**  
  
FEB 27 2013  
  
Inspection & Enforcement Management Unit  
(IEMU)

Name(s) and Signature(s) of Inspector(s)	Agency/Office/Phone and Fax Numbers	Date
Sandra Brozuský <u>Sandra Brozuský</u>	EPA OCE 206-553-5317	2/25/13
Matt Vojik	EPA OCE 206-553-0716	
Michael Isensee	WA Dept Agriculture, 360-354-7421	
Signature of Management Q A Reviewer	Agency/Office/Phone and Fax Numbers	Date
<u>Ron Ogale</u>	EPA/OCE/IEMU 3-0955	2/15/13

NPDES WA 4000616

ICIS  
2-28-2013  
J Brown

# INSTRUCTIONS

## Section A: National Data System Coding (i.e., PCS)

**Column 1: Transaction Code:** Use N, C, or D for New, Change, or Delete. All inspections will be *new* unless there is an error in the data entered.

**Columns 3-11: NPDES Permit No.** Enter the facility's NPDES permit number - third character in permit number indicates permit type for U=unpermitted, G=general permit, etc.. (Use the Remarks columns to record the State permit number, if necessary.)

**Columns 12-17: Inspection Date.** Insert the date entry was made into the facility. Use the year/month/day format (e.g., 04/10/01 = October 01, 2004).

**Column 18: Inspection Type\*.** Use one of the codes listed below to describe the type of inspection:

A Performance Audit	U IU Inspection with Pretreatment Audit	! Pretreatment Compliance (Oversight)
B Compliance Biomonitoring	X Toxics Inspection	@ Follow-up (enforcement)
C Compliance Evaluation (non-sampling)	Z Sludge - Biosolids	{ Storm Water-Construction-Sampling
D Diagnostic	# Combined Sewer Overflow-Sampling	} Storm Water-Construction-Non-Sampling
F Pretreatment (Follow-up)	\$ Combined Sewer Overflow-Non-Sampling	: Storm Water-Non-Construction-Sampling
G Pretreatment (Audit)	+ Sanitary Sewer Overflow-Sampling	~ Storm Water-Non-Construction-Non-Sampling
I Industrial User (IU) Inspection	& Sanitary Sewer Overflow-Non-Sampling	< Storm Water-MS4-Sampling
J Complaints	\ CAFO-Sampling	- Storm Water-MS4-Non-Sampling
M Multimedia	= CAFO-Non-Sampling	> Storm Water-MS4-Audit
N Spill	2 IU Sampling Inspection	
O Compliance Evaluation (Oversight)	3 IU Non-Sampling Inspection	
P Pretreatment Compliance Inspection	4 IU Toxics Inspection	
R Reconnaissance	5 IU Sampling Inspection with Pretreatment	
S Compliance Sampling	6 IU Non-Sampling Inspection with Pretreatment	
	7 IU Toxics with Pretreatment	

**Column 19: Inspector Code.** Use one of the codes listed below to describe the *lead agency* in the inspection.

A — State (Contractor)	O — Other Inspectors, Federal/EPA (Specify in Remarks columns)
B — EPA (Contractor)	P — Other Inspectors, State (Specify in Remarks columns)
E — Corps of Engineers	R — EPA Regional Inspector
J — Joint EPA/State Inspectors—EPA Lead	S — State Inspector
L — Local Health Department (State)	T — Joint State/EPA Inspectors—State lead
N — NEIC Inspectors	

**Column 20: Facility Type.** Use one of the codes below to describe the facility.

- 1 — Municipal. Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) with 1987 Standard Industrial Code (SIC) 4952.
- 2 — Industrial. Other than municipal, agricultural, and Federal facilities.
- 3 — Agricultural. Facilities classified with 1987 SIC 0111 to 0971.
- 4 — Federal. Facilities identified as Federal by the EPA Regional Office.
- 5 — Oil & Gas. Facilities classified with 1987 SIC 1311 to 1389.

**Columns 21-66: Remarks.** These columns are reserved for remarks at the discretion of the Region.

**Columns 67-69: Inspection Work Days.** Estimate the total work effort (to the nearest 0.1 work day), up to 99.9 days, that were used to complete the inspection and submit a QA reviewed report of findings. This estimate includes the accumulative effort of all participating inspectors; any effort for laboratory analyses, testing, and remote sensing; and the billed payroll time for travel and pre and post inspection preparation. This estimate does not require detailed documentation.

**Column 70: Facility Evaluation Rating.** Use information gathered during the inspection (regardless of inspection type) to evaluate the quality of the facility self-monitoring program. Grade the program using a scale of 1 to 5 with a score of 5 being used for very reliable self-monitoring programs, 3 being satisfactory, and 1 being used for very unreliable programs.

**Column 71: Biomonitoring Information.** Enter D for static testing. Enter F for flow through testing. Enter N for no biomonitoring.

**Column 72: Quality Assurance Data Inspection.** Enter Q if the inspection was conducted as followup on quality assurance sample results. Enter N otherwise.

**Columns 73-80:** These columns are reserved for regionally defined information.

## Section B: Facility Data

This section is self-explanatory except for "Other Facility Data," which may include new information not in the permit or PCS (e.g., new outfalls, names of receiving waters, new ownership, other updates to the record, SIC/NAICS Codes, Latitude/Longitude).

## Section C: Areas Evaluated During Inspection

Check only those areas evaluated by marking the appropriate box. Use Section D and additional sheets as necessary. Support the findings, as necessary, in a brief narrative report. Use the headings given on the report form (e.g., Permit, Records/Reports) when discussing the areas evaluated during the inspection.

## Section D: Summary of Findings/Comments

Briefly summarize the inspection findings. This summary should abstract the pertinent inspection findings, not replace the narrative report. Reference a list of attachments, such as completed checklists taken from the NPDES Compliance Inspection Manuals and pretreatment guidance documents, including effluent data when sampling has been done. Use extra sheets as necessary.

\*Footnote: In addition to the inspection types listed above under column 18, a state may continue to use the following wet weather and CAFO inspection types until the state is brought into ICIS-NPDES: K: CAFO, V: SSO, Y: CSO, W: Storm Water 9: MS4. States may also use the new wet weather, CAFO and MS4 inspections types shown in column 18 of this form. The EPA regions are required to use the new wet weather, CAFO, and MS4 inspection types for inspections with an inspection date (DTIN) on or after July 1, 2005.



# Water Compliance Inspection Report

## Section A: National Data System Coding (i.e., PCS)

[illegible]

## Section B: Facility Data

Name and Location of Facility Inspected (For industrial users discharging to POTW, also include POTW name and NPDES permit number) E. Badger Road Ditch, <b>Lynden, WA 98264</b> 48.964607, -122.445462	Entry Time/Date 2/12/13	Permit Effective Date
	Exit Time/Date 2/12/13	Permit Expiration Date
Name(s) of On-Site Representative(s)/Title(s)/Phone and Fax Number(s)	Other Facility Data (e.g., SIC NAICS, and other descriptive information)  Reconnaissance Sampling of Public Right-Of-Way Ditch	
Name, Address of Responsible Official/Title/Phone and Fax Number  <div style="text-align: right;"> <b>Contacted</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No         </div>		

## Section C: Areas Evaluated During Inspection (Check only those areas evaluated)

<input type="checkbox"/> Permit	<input type="checkbox"/> Self-Monitoring Program	<input type="checkbox"/> Pretreatment	<input type="checkbox"/> MS4
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Records/Reports</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Compliance Schedules	<input type="checkbox"/> Pollution Prevention	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Facility Site Review	<input type="checkbox"/> Laboratory	<input type="checkbox"/> Storm Water	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Effluent/Receiving Waters	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operations & Maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/> Combined Sewer Overflow	
<input type="checkbox"/> Flow Measurement	<input type="checkbox"/> Sludge Handling/Disposal	<input type="checkbox"/> Sanitary Sewer Overflow	

## Section D: Summary of Findings/Comments



(Attach additional sheets of narrative and checklists, including Single Event Violation codes, as necessary)

SEV Codes	SEV Description
● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●	
● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●	
● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●	
● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●	

RECEIVED

FEB 27 2013

Inspection & Enforcement Management Unit  
(IEMU)

Name(s) and Signature(s) of Inspector(s)	Agency/Office/Phone and Fax Numbers	Date
Sandra Brozusky 	EPA OCE 206-553-5317	2/25/13
Matt Vojik	EPA OCE 206-553-0716	
Signature of Management Q A Reviewer	Agency/Office/Phone and Fax Numbers	Date
	EPA/OCE/ICMU 3-0955	4/5/13

NPDES WAU000617

ICIS.

2-28-2013

Y Brown

# INSTRUCTIONS

## Section A: National Data System Coding (i.e., PCS)

**Column 1: Transaction Code:** Use N, C, or D for New, Change, or Delete. All inspections will be *new* unless there is an error in the data entered.

**Columns 3-11: NPDES Permit No.** Enter the facility's NPDES permit number - third character in permit number indicates permit type for U=unpermitted, G=general permit, etc.. (Use the Remarks columns to record the State permit number, if necessary.)

**Columns 12-17: Inspection Date.** Insert the date entry was made into the facility. Use the year/month/day format (e.g., 04/10/01 = October 01, 2004).

**Column 18: Inspection Type\*.** Use one of the codes listed below to describe the type of inspection:

A Performance Audit	U IU Inspection with Pretreatment Audit	I Pretreatment Compliance (Oversight)
B Compliance Biomonitoring	X Toxics Inspection	@ Follow-up (enforcement)
C Compliance Evaluation (non-sampling)	Z Sludge - Biosolids	{ Storm Water-Construction-Sampling
D Diagnostic	# Combined Sewer Overflow-Sampling	} Storm Water-Construction-Non-Sampling
F Pretreatment (Follow-up)	\$ Combined Sewer Overflow-Non-Sampling	: Storm Water-Non-Construction-Sampling
G Pretreatment (Audit)	+ Sanitary Sewer Overflow-Sampling	~ Storm Water-Non-Construction-Non-Sampling
I Industrial User (IU) Inspection	& Sanitary Sewer Overflow-Non-Sampling	< Storm Water-MS4-Sampling
J Complaints	\ CAFO-Sampling	- Storm Water-MS4-Non-Sampling
M Multimedia	= CAFO-Non-Sampling	> Storm Water-MS4-Audit
N Spill	2 IU Sampling Inspection	
O Compliance Evaluation (Oversight)	3 IU Non-Sampling Inspection	
P Pretreatment Compliance Inspection	4 IU Toxics Inspection	
R Reconnaissance	5 IU Sampling Inspection with Pretreatment	
S Compliance Sampling	6 IU Non-Sampling Inspection with Pretreatment	
	7 IU Toxics with Pretreatment	

**Column 19: Inspector Code.** Use one of the codes listed below to describe the *lead agency* in the inspection.

A — State (Contractor)	O — Other Inspectors, Federal/EPA (Specify in Remarks columns)
B — EPA (Contractor)	P — Other Inspectors, State (Specify in Remarks columns)
E — Corps of Engineers	R — EPA Regional Inspector
J — Joint EPA/State Inspectors—EPA Lead	S — State Inspector
L — Local Health Department (State)	T — Joint State/EPA Inspectors—State lead
N — NEIC Inspectors	

**Column 20: Facility Type.** Use one of the codes below to describe the facility.

- 1 — Municipal. Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) with 1987 Standard Industrial Code (SIC) 4952.
- 2 — Industrial. Other than municipal, agricultural, and Federal facilities.
- 3 — Agricultural. Facilities classified with 1987 SIC 0111 to 0971.
- 4 — Federal. Facilities identified as Federal by the EPA Regional Office.
- 5 — Oil & Gas. Facilities classified with 1987 SIC 1311 to 1389.

**Columns 21-66: Remarks.** These columns are reserved for remarks at the discretion of the Region.

**Columns 67-69: Inspection Work Days.** Estimate the total work effort (to the nearest 0.1 work day), up to 99.9 days, that were used to complete the inspection and submit a QA reviewed report of findings. This estimate includes the accumulative effort of all participating inspectors; any effort for laboratory analyses, testing, and remote sensing; and the billed payroll time for travel and pre and post inspection preparation. This estimate does not require detailed documentation.

**Column 70: Facility Evaluation Rating.** Use information gathered during the inspection (regardless of inspection type) to evaluate the quality of the facility self-monitoring program. Grade the program using a scale of 1 to 5 with a score of 5 being used for very reliable self-monitoring programs, 3 being satisfactory, and 1 being used for very unreliable programs.

**Column 71: Biomonitoring Information.** Enter D for static testing. Enter F for flow through testing. Enter N for no biomonitoring.

**Column 72: Quality Assurance Data Inspection.** Enter Q if the inspection was conducted as followup on quality assurance sample results. Enter N otherwise.

**Columns 73-80:** These columns are reserved for regionally defined information.

## Section B: Facility Data

This section is self-explanatory except for "Other Facility Data," which may include new information not in the permit or PCS (e.g., new outfalls, names of receiving waters, new ownership, other updates to the record, SIC/NAICS Codes, Latitude/Longitude).

## Section C: Areas Evaluated During Inspection

Check only those areas evaluated by marking the appropriate box. Use Section D and additional sheets as necessary. Support the findings, as necessary, in a brief narrative report. Use the headings given on the report form (e.g., Permit, Records/Reports) when discussing the areas evaluated during the inspection.

## Section D: Summary of Findings/Comments

Briefly summarize the inspection findings. This summary should abstract the pertinent inspection findings, not replace the narrative report. Reference a list of attachments, such as completed checklists taken from the NPDES Compliance Inspection Manuals and pretreatment guidance documents, including effluent data when sampling has been done. Use extra sheets as necessary.

\*Footnote: In addition to the inspection types listed above under column 18, a state may continue to use the following wet weather and CAFO inspection types until the state is brought into ICIS-NPDES: K: CAFO, V: SSO, Y: CSO, W: Storm Water 9: MS4. States may also use the new wet weather, CAFO and MS4 inspections types shown in column 18 of this form. The EPA regions are required to use the new wet weather, CAFO, and MS4 inspection types for inspections with an inspection date (DTIN) on or after July 1, 2005.





United States Environmental Protection Agency  
Washington, D.C. 20460

## Water Compliance Inspection Report

### Section A: National Data System Coding (i.e., PCS)

Transaction Code	NPDES	yr/mo/day	Inspection Type	Inspector	Fac Type
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	WAU0006116	1 3 0 2 2 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> R	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3
Remarks					
21					
66					
Inspection Work Days	Facility Self-Monitoring Evaluation Rating	BI	QA	Reserved	
67 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> 69	70 <input type="checkbox"/>	71 <input type="checkbox"/>	72 <input type="checkbox"/>	73 <input type="checkbox"/> 74	75 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> 80

### Section B: Facility Data

Name and Location of Facility Inspected (For industrial users discharging to POTW, also include POTW name and NPDES permit number) R Bajema Farm Inc 792 E Badger Rd Lynden, WA 98264	Entry Time/Date 2/21/13 11:06 am	Permit Effective Date
	Exit Time/Date 2/21/13 1:30 pm	Permit Expiration Date
Name(s) of On-Site Representative(s)/Title(s)/Phone and Fax Number(s) Roger Bajema, Owner, 360-815-1383	Other Facility Data (e.g., SIC NAICS, and other descriptive information)  Unpermitted  NAICS: 11212 <del>0</del> <i>Y</i>	
Name, Address of Responsible Official/Title/Phone and Fax Number Roger Bajema 792 E Badger Rd Lynden, WA 98264	Contacted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

### Section C: Areas Evaluated During Inspection (Check only those areas evaluated)

<input type="checkbox"/> Permit	<input type="checkbox"/> Self-Monitoring Program	<input type="checkbox"/> Pretreatment	<input type="checkbox"/> MS4
<input type="checkbox"/> Records/Reports	<input type="checkbox"/> Compliance Schedules	<input type="checkbox"/> Pollution Prevention	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Facility Site Review	<input type="checkbox"/> Laboratory	<input type="checkbox"/> Storm Water	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Effluent/Receiving Waters	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operations & Maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/> Combined Sewer Overflow	
<input type="checkbox"/> Flow Measurement	<input type="checkbox"/> Sludge Handling/Disposal	<input type="checkbox"/> Sanitary Sewer Overflow	

### Section D: Summary of Findings/Comments

(Attach additional sheets of narrative and checklists, including Single Event Violation codes, as necessary)

SEV Codes	SEV Description
• • • • •	
• • • • •	
• • • • •	
• • • • •	

RECEIVED

FEB 27 2013

Inspection & Enforcement Management Unit  
(IEMU)

Name(s) and Signature(s) of Inspector(s) Sandra Brozuský <i>Sandra Brozuský</i>	Agency/Office/Phone and Fax Numbers EPA OCE 206-553-5317	Date 2/25/13
Matt Vojik	EPA OCE 206-553-0716	
Signature of Management QA Reviewer <i>Jim Ogle</i>	Agency/Office/Phone and Fax Numbers EPA/OCE/IEMU 3-0955	Date 4/5/13

NPDES WAU0006116

ICIS

2-28-2013

*J Brown*

# INSTRUCTIONS

## Section A: National Data System Coding (i.e., PCS)

**Column 1: Transaction Code:** Use N, C, or D for New, Change, or Delete. All inspections will be *new* unless there is an error in the data entered.

**Columns 3-11: NPDES Permit No.** Enter the facility's NPDES permit number - third character in permit number indicates permit type for U=unpermitted, G=general permit, etc.. (Use the Remarks columns to record the State permit number, if necessary.)

**Columns 12-17: Inspection Date.** Insert the date entry was made into the facility. Use the year/month/day format (e.g., 04/10/01 = October 01, 2004).

**Column 18: Inspection Type\*.** Use one of the codes listed below to describe the type of inspection:

A	Performance Audit	U	IU Inspection with Pretreatment Audit	I	Pretreatment Compliance (Oversight)
B	Compliance Biomonitoring	X	Toxics Inspection	@	Follow-up (enforcement)
C	Compliance Evaluation (non-sampling)	Z	Sludge - Biosolids	{	Storm Water-Construction-Sampling
D	Diagnostic	#	Combined Sewer Overflow-Sampling	}	Storm Water-Construction-Non-Sampling
F	Pretreatment (Follow-up)	\$	Combined Sewer Overflow-Non-Sampling	:	Storm Water-Non-Construction-Sampling
G	Pretreatment (Audit)	+	Sanitary Sewer Overflow-Sampling	~	Storm Water-Non-Construction-Non-Sampling
I	Industrial User (IU) Inspection	&	Sanitary Sewer Overflow-Non-Sampling	<	Storm Water-MS4-Sampling
J	Complaints	\	CAFO-Sampling	-	Storm Water-MS4-Non-Sampling
M	Multimedia	=	CAFO-Non-Sampling	>	Storm Water-MS4-Audit
N	Spill	2	IU Sampling Inspection		
O	Compliance Evaluation (Oversight)	3	IU Non-Sampling Inspection		
P	Pretreatment Compliance Inspection	4	IU Toxics Inspection		
R	Reconnaissance	5	IU Sampling Inspection with Pretreatment		
S	Compliance Sampling	6	IU Non-Sampling Inspection with Pretreatment		
		7	IU Toxics with Pretreatment		

**Column 19: Inspector Code.** Use one of the codes listed below to describe the *lead* agency in the inspection.

A — State (Contractor)	O — Other Inspectors, Federal/EPA (Specify in Remarks columns)
B — EPA (Contractor)	P — Other Inspectors, State (Specify in Remarks columns)
E — Corps of Engineers	R — EPA Regional Inspector
J — Joint EPA/State Inspectors—EPA Lead	S — State Inspector
L — Local Health Department (State)	T — Joint State/EPA Inspectors—State lead
N — NEIC Inspectors	

**Column 20: Facility Type.** Use one of the codes below to describe the facility.

- 1 — Municipal. Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) with 1987 Standard Industrial Code (SIC) 4952.
- 2 — Industrial. Other than municipal, agricultural, and Federal facilities.
- 3 — Agricultural. Facilities classified with 1987 SIC 0111 to 0971.
- 4 — Federal. Facilities identified as Federal by the EPA Regional Office.
- 5 — Oil & Gas. Facilities classified with 1987 SIC 1311 to 1389.

**Columns 21-66: Remarks.** These columns are reserved for remarks at the discretion of the Region.

**Columns 67-69: Inspection Work Days.** Estimate the total work effort (to the nearest 0.1 work day), up to 99.9 days, that were used to complete the inspection and submit a QA reviewed report of findings. This estimate includes the accumulative effort of all participating inspectors; any effort for laboratory analyses, testing, and remote sensing; and the billed payroll time for travel and pre and post inspection preparation. This estimate does not require detailed documentation.

**Column 70: Facility Evaluation Rating.** Use information gathered during the inspection (regardless of inspection type) to evaluate the quality of the facility self-monitoring program. Grade the program using a scale of 1 to 5 with a score of 5 being used for very reliable self-monitoring programs, 3 being satisfactory, and 1 being used for very unreliable programs.

**Column 71: Biomonitoring Information.** Enter D for static testing. Enter F for flow through testing. Enter N for no biomonitoring.

**Column 72: Quality Assurance Data Inspection.** Enter Q if the inspection was conducted as followup on quality assurance sample results. Enter N otherwise.

**Columns 73-80:** These columns are reserved for regionally defined information.

## Section B: Facility Data

This section is self-explanatory except for "Other Facility Data," which may include new information not in the permit or PCS (e.g., new outfalls, names of receiving waters, new ownership, other updates to the record, SIC/NAICS Codes, Latitude/Longitude).

## Section C: Areas Evaluated During Inspection

Check only those areas evaluated by marking the appropriate box. Use Section D and additional sheets as necessary. Support the findings, as necessary, in a brief narrative report. Use the headings given on the report form (e.g., Permit, Records/Reports) when discussing the areas evaluated during the inspection.

## Section D: Summary of Findings/Comments

Briefly summarize the inspection findings. This summary should abstract the pertinent inspection findings, not replace the narrative report. Reference a list of attachments, such as completed checklists taken from the NPDES Compliance Inspection Manuals and pretreatment guidance documents, including effluent data when sampling has been done. Use extra sheets as necessary.

\*Footnote: In addition to the inspection types listed above under column 18, a state may continue to use the following wet weather and CAFO inspection types until the state is brought into ICIS-NPDES: K: CAFO, V: SSO, Y: CSO, W: Storm Water 9: MS4. States may also use the new wet weather, CAFO and MS4 inspections types shown in column 18 of this form. The EPA regions are required to use the new wet weather, CAFO, and MS4 inspection types for inspections with an inspection date (DTIN) on or after July 1, 2005.

**NPDES  
Inspection Report**

**R Bajema Farm, Inc.**

**Lynden, WA**

**February 12, 2013 and February 21, 2013**

**Prepared by:  
Sandra Brozusk  
Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10  
Office of Compliance and Enforcement  
Inspection and Enforcement Management Unit**





## **Table of Contents**

- I. Facility Information
- II. Inspection Information
- III. Permit Information
- IV. Background and Activity
- V. Individuals Present
- VI. Inspection Entry
- VII. Inspection Chronology
- VIII. Owner and Operator Information
- IX. Number of Animals
- X. Presence of Vegetation in the Confinement Areas
- XI. Length of Animal Confinement
- XII. Waste Management Process
- XIII. Observed Discharge
- XIV. Areas of Concern
- XV. Receiving Water
- XVI. Sample Collection and Analyses
- XVII. Closing Conference
- XVIII. Additional Observations

### **Attachments**

- A. Photograph Documentation
- B. Facility Aerial Images
- C. Sample Results





(Unless otherwise noted, all details in this inspection report were obtained from conversations with Roger Bajema or from observations during the inspection.)

**I. Facility Information**

Facility Name: R Bajema Farm, Inc.

Facility Type: Dairy (SIC = 0241, NAICS = 112120)

Facility Address: 792 E Badger Rd  
Lynden, WA 98264  
Whatcom County

GPS: 45.705667, -123.862500

Facility Phone #s: (360) 354-4546 (Facility), (b) (6) (Cell)

Facility Contact(s): Roger Bajema, Owner and Operator

**II. Inspection Information**

Inspection Dates: Reconnaissance with Sampling: February 12, 2013  
Compliance Inspection with Sampling: February 21, 2013

Arrival Time:	February 12, 2013 9:48 AM	February 21, 2013 11:06 AM
Departure Time:	2:20 PM	1:30 PM
Weather:	Raining on and off	Raining
Purpose:	Determination of compliance with the Clean Water Act	

**III. Permit Information**

This facility is currently unpermitted.

**IV. Background and Activity**

This is a dairy facility that has been owned and in operation by the current owner since 1958. The waste generated at this facility is mainly from the areas where animals are confined in the barn, milking parlor and dry cow confinement area. This waste includes manure and urine deposited in those confinement areas. The confinement areas are both covered and uncovered, encompassing a footprint of approximately 1.5 acres.

Waste from the main confinement areas is scraped or flushed into a below ground tank before being routed to an above ground storage lagoon. See the Waste Management section for more information.

Mr. Bajema owns and operates a farm equipment business, Roger Bajema Equipment, Inc. just west of the dairy facility. This business generally consists of farm equipment storage and an enclosed maintenance shop. Roger Bajema Equipment, Inc. was not part of this inspection.

**V. Individuals Present**

The inspectors present for the reconnaissance inspection on February 12, 2013 were Sandra Brozusky (EPA), Matt Vojik (EPA), Michael Isensee (Washington State Department of Agriculture) and Chris Luerkens (Washington State Department of Ecology). Inspectors present for the compliance sampling inspection on February 21, 2013 were Sandra Brozusky (EPA) and Matt Vojik (EPA).

The facility representative present during the February 21, 2013 inspection was Roger Bajema.

**VI. Inspection Entry**

We arrived at the facility at 9:40 AM on February 12, 2013. I attempted to contact a facility representative by ringing the doorbell of the front door to the business. With no response, I called the phone number posted on the front door specified for Mr. Bajema. At 9:48 AM I reached Mr. Bajema, introduced myself as an EPA inspector and stated that I was present to conduct a Clean Water Act compliance inspection of his dairy facility. Mr. Bajema stated that he was out of the state and would like EPA to make an appointment to conduct an inspection. I stated that it is EPA policy to conduct this type of inspection unannounced without appointments. I inquired if there was an employee that could guide us around that facility to complete the inspection. Mr. Bajema stated that he did not want EPA on his property while he was not present. He continued to state that it was dangerous for people to be on his property without him present. I inquired as to why it was dangerous, to which Mr. Bajema replied that it was just dangerous and that they like to protect their land. I told Mr. Bajema that I would relay information to EPA counsel and either myself or an EPA representative would contact him soon.

After Mr. Bajema and I spoke, Cliff Villa, EPA Office of Regional Counsel, left Mr. Bajema a message asking for a return call shortly.

Following my conversation with Mr. Bajema on February 12, 2013, the team of inspectors conducted reconnaissance observations and sampling from public right-of-ways. See the following section for more detail.

Mr. Bajema contacted me on February 13, 2013. I again discussed that my visit was to conduct a routine compliance inspection based on the Clean Water Act. Mr. Bajema



stated that he would be back in town on February 15, 2013 and that we could schedule an appointment for that day. I stated that EPA conducts this type of inspection unannounced but asked when he would be done with milking activities on any given day. He stated he is typically free anytime after 10:00 AM.

On February 21, 2013 I called Mr. Bajema on my cell phone approximately 30 minutes prior to arriving at the facility. With no answer, I left a message stating that EPA was driving to Mr. Bajema's facility to conduct a Clean Water Act inspection. Upon arrival, I knocked on the business door but there was no answer. I then called Mr. Bajema but there was no answer. Mr. Vojik proceeded to call Mr. Bajema from his cell phone and reached Mr. Bajema. At 11:06 AM we met Mr. Bajema at the front entrance to his facility. Upon meeting Mr. Bajema, we identified ourselves as EPA inspectors, presented our credentials and explained the purpose of our visit. Mr. Bajema did not deny us access at this time and accompanied us throughout the inspection.

## **VII. Inspection Chronology**

On February 12, 2013 the inspection team conducted reconnaissance observations and sampling from public right-of-ways. The inspection team made observations of facility operations, surface runoff, the location of drains and drainage into a roadside ditch adjacent to the facility. This ditch, herein referred to as "the ditch" ran parallel to E. Badger Road, on the north side of E. Badger Road. At this time, the inspection team observed two points where water was entering the ditch. See the Observed Discharge section of this report for more detail. During this reconnaissance the inspection team also collected samples from three locations. See attachment A photographs 3, 5, and 11 and the Sample Collection and Analyses section of this report for more detail.

On February 21, 2013 the inspection team began the inspection with a brief opening conference inside the office at the facility. During the opening conference, I explained that we were at the facility to conduct a compliance inspection based on the Clean Water Act and presented Mr. Bajema with an EPA Small Business Resources Information Sheet. We continued by asking Mr. Bajema questions related to waste management, facility operations and general administration.

After the opening conference, we proceeded to conduct a tour of the facility. The facility tour included an inspection of the barns, waste storage lagoon, solids storage areas, roof runoff collection points, silage storage, various drains on or near the property and the ditch. Following the facility tour, we conducted sampling. During the sampling portion of the inspection, Mr. Bajema also collected separate samples.

We ended the inspection with a brief exit interview where we identified areas of concern.

## **VIII. Owner and Operator Information**

This dairy is owned and operated by Roger Bajema.

**IX. Number of Animals**

At the time of inspection, Mr. Bajema indicated that the property housed a total of approximately 350 head, approximately 300 of which were milking.

**X. Presence of Vegetation in the Confinement Areas**

The barns at this facility (where the animals are fed and maintained) had concrete floors. Based on my observation at the time of the inspection, the confinement barns were devoid of vegetation.

**XI. Length of Animal Confinement**

According to Mr. Bajema, the animals are confined year round.

**XII. Waste Management Process**

The facility has one below ground tank, one storage lagoon and solid manure storage. According to Mr. Bajema, the storage lagoon holds approximately 4 million gallons. Waste from the confinement areas is either scraped or flushed into the below ground tank before being routed to the storage lagoon. The lagoon was the first one installed in Washington State, according to Mr. Bajema.

The facility also has one uncovered dry cow confinement area. At the time of this report, the EPA inspectors do not have enough information to determine how waste in this confinement area is handled. However, this confinement area floor consisted of wood chips and did not have any visible containment system to prevent waste runoff from exiting this confinement area. See attachment A photograph 2 for a view of the dry cow confinement area.

Mr. Bajema stated that the facility has a total of approximately 300 acres (owned and leased) of land used for waste application. Waste is applied using a sprinkler and a solids spreader. Mr. Bajema speculated that the most recent land application for liquids was November 1, 2012 and January 15, 2013 for solids.

**XIII. Observed Discharge**

On February 12 and 21, 2013, I saw a discharge into the north side of the ditch adjacent to the facility. On February 21, 2013 I also saw runoff coming from the facility and entering a drain. Mr. Bajema indicated that this drain routes water to the ditch. See the Areas of Concern section below for more details.

**XIV. Areas of Concern**

We inspected the facility including the confinement areas and the waste handling system and identified the following areas of concern during the inspection:



A. Discharge from Dry Cow Confinement Area

On February 21, 2013 the EPA inspectors toured the facility including a confinement area located on the southeast corner of the facility. According to Mr. Bajema, this confinement area holds dry cows. Mr. Bajema stated that the length of time which this confinement area houses dry cows varies from a couple of hours to multiple days, depending on the weather. This confinement area flooring was devoid of vegetation and contained a combination of what appeared to be wood chips and manure. See attachment A photographs 1-2 for views of this confinement area.

While walking the perimeter of this confinement area on February 21, 2013, I saw a trench had been dug out and ran from the southeast corner of the confinement area, along the southern perimeter toward a drain. Mr. Bajema stated water that enters this drain is routed via underground piping to the ditch. The EPA inspectors did not observe this trench or drain on February 12, 2013.

The dry cow confinement area was uncovered and exposed to precipitation. In general, the slope along the eastern perimeter of this confinement area was toward the road and trench. The trench would route runoff from portions of this confinement area toward the drain. On February 21, 2013 I saw water flowing in the trench and discharging into the drain. I also saw runoff near the eastern perimeter of the confinement area enter the trench.

EPA inspectors collected a water sample of runoff in the trench on February 21, 2013. This sample was analyzed for Fecal Coliform and E. coli. See the sample collection and analysis section of this report for more details. Also see attachment A photograph 3 for the location of this sample and attachment B aerials 2-3 for an overview of the sample location.

B. Roof Runoff Discharge

On February 12, 2013, the inspection team walked the ditch along the road side, to make observations of any discharges into the ditch. At this time, I saw a flow of water enter into the ditch, coming from the north, from the direction of the facility. EPA inspectors collected water samples of this flow which were analyzed for Biochemical Oxygen Demand, Fecal Coliform, E. coli, Potassium and Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen. See the Sample Collection and Analyses section of this report for the results of these analyses.

On February 21, 2013 we toured the facility, including observations of the roof runoff drainages for various barn roofs. The EPA inspectors inquired about where the roof runoff drainage was routed. Mr. Bajema stated this runoff ultimately enters the ditch through underground drain pipes. The EPA inspectors informed Mr. Bajema that we collected samples on February 12, 2013 of a flow of water entering this ditch and that the results of the Fecal Coliform and E. coli analysis appeared high (we did not provide a specific numerical result at this time). Mr.

Bajema then described a potential reason for the high results. Roof runoff from the confinement barn on the northern side of the facility drains into a cement trough. Water in this trough is routed to a drain hole, through underground piping and into the ditch. This piping travels east toward an application field and then south until it reached the ditch. Mr. Bajema stated that this pipe, at the location of the application field, was at a shallow depth in the ground, and had been broken. He presumed it was broken by the corn chopper when processing the corn in this field. Mr. Bajema continued to state that this broken pipe was potentially draining water collecting in a portion of the field that also contained applied manure. Water and applied manure that enter this broken pipe would then drain into the ditch.

Mr. Bajema stated he paid for a service to pump the water out of the ditch approximately 9 days prior to our February 21, 2013 inspection. He stated that he had this water pumped as a result of EPA's initial presence on February 12, 2013 and following his discovery that the pipe has been broken. He was unsure as to the length of time the pipe had been broken. Mr. Bajema stated that he used his employees to repair the pipe.

On February 21, 2013 the EPA inspectors collected water samples at the same roof runoff discharge point sampled on February 12, 2013. See the Sample Collection and Analyses section of this report for more detail.

See attachment A photographs 5-10 for details of this discharge. See attachment B aerials 1 and 3 for an overview of the sample location and the approximate flow of the roof runoff.

#### **XV. Receiving Water**

A road side ditch, "the ditch", runs adjacent to the facility, parallel to E. Badger Road. On February 21, 2013 the EPA inspectors followed this ditch until it passed through a culvert on the west side of Bender Road at the intersection of E. Badger Road. On the east side of Bender Road there was another open water conveyance that ran south. According to information obtained from the Whatcom County Conservation District, it appears that the open water conveyance that runs south along Bender Road (identified as Bender Road Ditch) ultimately discharges into Fishtrap Creek. According to the Washington State Department of Ecology (WDOE), Fishtrap Creek is a tributary to the Nooksack River and in 1995 WDOE completed a TMDL study for Fishtrap Creek. (<https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/publications/95328.pdf>)

On February 12, 2013 the ditch, at the culvert entry point at the intersection of E. Badger Road and Bender Road, did not have water flowing. On February 21, 2013 the same location of the ditch did have water flowing. See attachment A photographs 12-14 for views of the ditch at this location. Also see attachment B aerial 4 for more details on the ditch and the open water conveyance.



## **XVI. Sample Collection and Analyses**

This section of the permit lays out details of samples collected on February 12, 2013 and February 21, 2013. All samples taken by EPA inspectors were placed in a cooler on ice following collection, preserved as necessary and hand delivered to each laboratory for analysis. The EPA Manchester Lab was utilized for Potassium, Phosphorus, Nitrate-Nitrite and Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN) analysis. Avocet Environmental Testing in Bellingham, Washington was utilized for Fecal Coliform, E. Coli and Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) analysis. The following describes the results of these samples:

### February 12, 2013:

On February 12, 2013 the EPA inspection team conducted reconnaissance sampling of various water flows that were adjacent to the facility. These samples were collected in order to gather information about whether these water flows adjacent to the facility contained various pollutants. At this time, the EPA inspection team observed a flow of water entering the side of the ditch and was coming from the direction of the facility.

**Sample #13064100:** Water samples were collected of the water in the ditch, adjacent to the facility. Specifically, the sample was collected approximately 75 feet downstream from the beginning surface flow of the ditch. The purpose of this sample was to determine whether there were pollutants in the ditch just downstream of the unknown flow of water entering the side of the ditch. See attachment A photograph 1 for this sample location. Samples were analyzed for Potassium, Phosphorus, Nitrate-Nitrite, TKN, BOD, Fecal Coliform and E. coli. The results are as follows:

Potassium	Phosphorus	Nitrate-Nitrite	TKN	BOD	Fecal Coliform/E. coli
109,000 ug/L	6.79 mg/L	Below Detectible Level	71.8 mg/L	370 mg/L	580,000 FC/100 ml 580,000 E. coli/100 ml

**Sample #13064101:** Water samples were collected of an unknown flow of water entering the side of the ditch. This flow was coming from the north, from the direction of the facility and discharging into the ditch approximately 50 feet downstream from the beginning surface flow of the ditch. The samples were collected of the flow of water, just prior to entering the ditch. The purpose of this sample was to determine whether there were pollutants in this flow of water entering and contributing to the water in the ditch. See attachment A photographs 5-6 for views of this water flow and sample location. Samples were analyzed for Potassium, Phosphorus, Nitrate-Nitrite, TKN, BOD, Fecal Coliform and E. coli. The results are as follows:

Potassium	Phosphorus	Nitrate-Nitrite	TKN	BOD	Fecal Coliform/E. coli
65,300 ug/L	4.68 mg/L	Below Detectible Level	51.8 mg/L	220 mg/L	270,000 FC/100 ml 270,000 E. coli/100 ml



**Sample #13064102:** This water sample was collected of the flow of water entering the beginning of the ditch. The purpose of this sample was to determine whether pollutants were entering the ditch. At the time of this sample collection, the rain and flow of water from the beginning of the ditch had diminished. The minimal flow provided only enough flow for one sample collection of Fecal Coliform and E. coli. See attachment A photograph 11 for a view of this sample location.

The E. coli result of the sample collected in this location is 38,000 E. coli/100ml. The Fecal Coliform result of the sample collected in this location is 38,000 FC/100ml.

**Sample #13064103:** This water sample was a transfer blank. The purpose of this sample was to determine if contaminants were introduced into the sample through field sampling procedures.

The E. coli result of this sample is <2 E. coli/100ml. The Fecal Coliform result of this sample is <2 FC/100ml.

#### February 21, 2013

During the field tour of the inspection, the EPA inspection team collected water samples to document various discharges from the facility.

**Sample #13074100:** The water sample was collected of the roof runoff drainage, just prior to discharging into the ditch, approximately 50 feet downstream from the beginning surface flow of the ditch. The purpose of this sample was to determine whether there were pollutants in this flow of water from the facility entering and contributing to the water in the ditch. This sample location was the same as sample #13064101 taken on February 12, 2013. The sample was analyzed for Fecal Coliform and E. coli.

The E. coli result of the sample collected in this location is 31,000 E. coli/100ml. The Fecal Coliform result of the sample collected in this location is 31,000 FC/100ml.

**Sample #13074101:** This water sample was collected of the flow of water entering the beginning of the ditch. The purpose of this sample was to determine whether pollutants from the facility were entering the ditch. This sample location was the same as sample #13064102. The sample was analyzed for Fecal Coliform and E. coli.

The E. coli result of the sample collected in this location is 24,000 E. coli/100ml. The Fecal Coliform result of the sample collected in this location is 24,000 FC/100ml.

**Sample #13074102:** This water sample was collected of the surface flow of water from the eastern perimeter of the dry cow confinement area. The sample was collected of the flow prior to entering a drain, which according to Mr. Bajema routes water to the ditch. The purpose of this sample was to determine whether pollutants from the dry cow confinement area were entering the drain and contributing to the water in the ditch. See attachment A photograph 3 for a view of the sample location and water flow. The sample was analyzed for Fecal Coliform and E. coli.

The E. coli result of the sample collected in this location is 240,000 E. coli/100ml. The Fecal Coliform result of the sample collected in this location is 240,000 FC/100ml.

**Sample #13074103:** This water sample was a transfer blank. The purpose of this sample was to determine if contaminants were introduced into the sample through field sampling procedures.

The E. coli result of this sample is <1 E. coli/100ml. The Fecal Coliform result of this sample is <1 FC/100ml.

See attachment C for the full details of the sample results. Matt Vojik and I (Sandra Brozusky) collected the samples at the time of inspection. Also see attachment B aerial 3 for approximate sample locations.

## **XVII. Closing Conference**

The closing conference was held following the site inspection and sample collection. The individuals present included the inspection team (Sandra Brozusky and Matt Vojik) and Roger Bajema. During the closing conference I discussed the areas of concern identified above. Mr. Bajema requested copies of the inspection report and the results for samples collected by EPA.

## **XVIII. Additional Observations**

### **A. Additional Drains Routing Water to Ditch**

Two additional drains on or near the property were noted during the February 21, 2013 inspection, which according to Mr. Bajema both route water to the ditch. See attachment B aerial 3 for a view of the location of these drains.

One drain was located on the property just south of the milk house. On February 12 and 21, 2013 we observed water flowing into this drain. According to Mr. Bajema this drain is used to drain roof runoff primarily from the milk house. Occasionally Mr. Bajema will pump water from a well to help remove sediment



and route this water to the drain. See attachment A photographs 18 and 19 for more details of this drain.

The second drain was located in between the dry cow confinement area and the ditch, on what appeared to be public roadway. Mr. Bajema stated that he did not install this drain and was put in by the city or county for runoff from the public road. On February 12 and 21, 2013 we observed water flowing into this drain. See attachment A photograph 15 for a view of this drain.

B. Separate Sample Collection by Mr. Bajema

On February 21, 2013, Mr. Bajema stated that he wanted to collect personal samples along with the EPA inspection team for individual analysis. The EPA inspection team was able to provide one sample bottle for Mr. Bajema to use for Fecal Coliform and E. coli analysis. The remaining samples for Mr. Bajema's set were collected in glass jars he obtained. The EPA inspectors physically collected these samples for Mr. Bajema, following our own sample collection. The EPA inspectors stated that delivery and analysis of these samples were of the responsibility of Mr. Bajema. Mr. Bajema's samples were from the same sample location as sample # 13074100 and # 13074101. However, Mr. Bajema did not collect at the same location of sample #13074102. Instead Mr. Bajema collected a sample of the flow of water in a channel that drained runoff from the direction of the road into the trench next to the dry cow confinement area. See attachment A photograph 4 for a view of this sample location.

C. Road Side Ditch West of Facility

Approximately 200 yards west of the beginning surface flow in the ditch is another ditch. On February 12 and 21, 2013 the EPA inspectors walked west of the facility to make observations of any water flowing in this ditch. The EPA inspectors were inquiring about whether the ditch west of the facility may be contributing to the water flow seen in the ditch. On both February 12 and 21, 2013 this ditch west of the facility did not have water flowing in it. This ditch did not have observable piping or a culvert that would suggest the two ditches were connected. In addition, Mr. Isensee stated that this additional ditch on the west side of the facility is slopped in a westerly direction, away from the facility. See attachment A photograph 20 for a view of this ditch and attachment B aerial 1 for the location of this ditch.

**Report Completion Date:**

4/16/13

**Lead Inspector Signature:**

Janet Bruns